REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated January 5, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-33 are rejected by the Examiner. With this response, claims 1, 2, 6, 19, 22, and 29 are hereby amended and claim 5 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-4, and 6-33 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 2-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 1-4, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Related Art (hereinafter "ARA") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,628,261 to Sato et al. (hereinafter "Sato").

The rejection of claims 2-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

With respect to claim 2, claim 2 has been amended to remove the limitation cited by the Examiner as failing to comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Applicants submit that support for the subject matter recited in claim 2 can be found at least in FIG. 11, and the associated text of Applicants' specification. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 2 fully complies with the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

With respect to claims 5, claim 5 has been canceled and Applicants submit that the rejection to claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph is moot.

With respect to claim 29, claim 29 has been amended to remove the limitation cited by the Examiner, and Applicants respectfully submit that claim 29 as amended fully complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Applicants submit that claims 2, 5, and 29 fully comply with the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Claims 3-28 and 30-33 were rejected based on their respective dependencies from claims 2, 5, and 29. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph of claims 2-33 be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 1-4, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA in view of Sato is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicants submit that ARA and Sato analyzed singly or in combination, do not teach the combined features of claims 1-4, 12, and 13.

Independent claim 1 recites a liquid crystal display device having a combination of including "a switch controller coupled to the sampling switch array and the control chip, wherein the switch controller alternately applies a first turn on pulse having a first absolute value and a second turn-on pulse having a second absolute value to the sampling switch array in accordance with a polarity of the video signals applied from the control chip." In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner acknowledges that ARA does not teach "wherein the switch controller controls the sampling switch array in accordance with a polarity of the video signals applied from the control chip."

The Examiner cites Sato as teaching "wherein the switch controller controls the sampling switch array in accordance with a polarity of the video signals applied from the control chip" to allegedly cure the deficiencies in the teachings of ARA. Applicants submit that even assuming that the Examiner's conclusion concerning the teachings of Sato is correct, Sato does not teach "the switch controller alternately applies a first turn on pulse having a first absolute value and a second turn-on pulse having a second absolute value to the sampling switch array in accordance with a polarity of the video signals applied from the control chip." For example, the turn-on pulses disclosed in Sato are not disclosed to have different absolute values. Applicants submit that ARA and Sato, analyzed singly or in combination, do not teach at least the above identified combination of features recited in claim 1, and accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over ARA and Sato.

Applicants note that claims 2-4, 12, and 13 depend from claim 1 and that each includes all of the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 2-4, 12,

and 13 are each allowable over ARA and Sato at least because of their dependencies and for the reasons given for claim 1.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: April 4, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes

Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicants